



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

## REVIEWS AND NOTICES

---

*Commentary, Critical and Explanatory, on the Norwegian Text of Henrik Ibsen's Peer Gynt, Its Language, Literary Associations, and Folklore.* BY H. LOGEMAN. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1917. 9 Gld.

Dr. Logeman was professor of English philology at the Belgian University of Ghent, and is now undergoing temporary exile, as the place of publication of the work above indicates. For several years he has been devoting especial attention to the study of Ibsen's masterpiece, a study that has already borne fruit in several articles in philological periodicals.

In the present work the fundamental part, which illogically follows the other,<sup>1</sup> is the textual criticism (pp. 365-464), an accomplishment of scholarship which the reviewer, despite the odium of comparisons and a consciousness of the American proneness to superlatives, would not hesitate to call the best in the history of Ibsen study. Some of its most striking results had already been published separately in 1914 in the Norwegian periodical *Edda* (II, 136 ff.) with effects, particularly upon the Gyldendal publishing house, on which the author is now able to comment. For the work he has had at his disposal all the material, consisting of two manuscripts in the possession of the Royal Library in Copenhagen: U, the original *Udkast*,<sup>2</sup> some readings from which had been printed in the *Efterladte Skrifter*,<sup>3</sup> and R, the *Renskrift* prepared by Ibsen for the printer, but, as Logeman shows, never printed with scrupulous exactness; further the sixteen separate editions of *Peer Gynt* published from 1867 to 1915, and the *Peer Gynt* volume of the three editions of Ibsen's collected works: the *Folkeudgave* (III, 1898), the *Mindeudgave* (II, 1906<sup>4</sup>), and the *Jubilæumsudgave* (III, 1913<sup>5</sup>). To these is added as manuscript I,

<sup>1</sup> The author strangely calls it a supplement of the commentary (p. 372).

<sup>2</sup> Logeman calls it in the new Norwegian orthography *Utkast* in spite of the usage of Ibsen and the *Efterladte Skrifter*.

<sup>3</sup> Published by Koht and Elias in three volumes, 1909.

<sup>4</sup> Wrongly dated by Logeman 1908. His copy represents a second variety showing some corrected mistakes, and it is not inconceivable that the date given may stand in relation to this revision, though no record of it is found in the book-trade. The facts about this edition should have been further cleared up.

<sup>5</sup> Dated by Logeman 1914. It is of course the centennial year 1914 that the edition was intended to celebrate, but according to the *Dansk Bogfortegnelse for Aarene*, 1909-14, p. 152 (published in 1916) the first three volumes of the *Jubilæumsudgave* actually came out in 1913.

the copy of edition 2 (1867) corrected by Ibsen for the printing of the third edition (1874), which manuscript is now in the possession of the Christiania University Library. From the various editions Logeman is able, without making his list exhaustive, to show 391 readings of R that have been altered, the number as a rule naturally increasing from edition to edition. One of the most surprising results is the demonstration that Professor Johan Storm of Christiania, who was entrusted with the revision of the text for the *Mindeudgave* and who is a philologist of unquestioned distinction, proceeded in this matter less as a philologist than as an Academy of Letters, and while recognizing many errors, failed through philologically faulty method to detect a number of others, and even introduced arbitrary changes. Of course many of the alterations occurring in the different editions are minor ones of spelling or punctuation which do not affect the sense; there are however a surprisingly large number in which the original meaning of Ibsen is in greater or less degree modified.

The commentary forms the major part of the book, pages 1-363 with addenda, pages 465-68. The passages chosen for comment are numbered in accordance with the lines of an edition once planned by the author, but with references at the bottom of each page to the pagination of various editions. The passage is usually given in the Norwegian reading of the first edition, followed by the English of the Archer translation.<sup>1</sup> The commentator finds the Archer translation fairly accurate, but criticizes it justly at points. He also comments upon other translations in various languages, showing on his own part a fine appreciation of the Norwegian original, without which no one other than a Norwegian could be justified in attempting a commentary. It should be added that he has drawn freely upon Norwegian scholars for opinions upon uncertain points. The English of the commentary, though fluent, would have profited by a revision, and the proofreading was not all that could be desired, a fact covered by an apology of the author.

As to the matter of the commentary itself, the choice of passages for comment and the direction that the comment takes is of course to some degree governed by subjective considerations, and the two commentaries now being prepared by Norwegians will, as the author suggests, probably not be rendered entirely superfluous by his work. Nevertheless the comments contain a wealth of valuable material with very little dross. The few following points were noted which seem to contain errors or justify questions:

Pp. 16 f., l. 227. *saltstrød*. The commentator shows here a tendency not infrequently observable nowadays of overworking the folklore explanation. However as he gives in a footnote the natural explanation offered by a correspondent and leaves the reader liberty of choice, no serious offence can be taken.

<sup>1</sup> Sometimes, as for example in the case of lines 4360-61 (p. 331), the translation is omitted.

P. 17, in footnote; the Norwegian *tiur* is wrongly translated by "wood-cock"; it should be "capercaillie" or "cock of the wood," a very different bird.

P. 25, *Capetown* is a slip for *Charlestown* (i.e., Charleston).

P. 32, l. 437, *Signe Reisen*. Why the commentator would make *signe* an infinitive is not clear. It is surely a subjunctive, and the complete expression would be: *Gud signe Rejsen!* "(May) God bless your journey!" "A happy journey to you!" Compare the common use of *velsigne*.

Pp. 47 f. Woerner's incorrect etymology of *Solvejg* is noted, but there is no Old Norse *vejg* meaning "woman."<sup>1</sup> The matter had already been discussed by the reviewer.<sup>2</sup>

Pp. 59 f., l. 702, *Kommer drivende*. With all recognition of the interesting remarks on *piskende Dgd* (l. 535) one finds it difficult to see their application to the present case and is not entirely persuaded that *drivende* should not be called a present participle.

P. 61, l. 715, *spytter i Hænderne*. That spitting on the hands is a folkloristic survival is perhaps not impossible, but such possibility certainly has no bearing upon its occurrence in the poem itself.

P. 84, l. 962, *Aldrig skal jeg dig i Haaret trække*. The translation should have been corrected, as the expression does not mean "to drag one about by the hair," but simply "to pull one's hair." In the same way in line 1527 (p. 86) *Jeg skal slaa dig i Skallen* does not mean "I'll split your skull open," but only "I'll hit you on the head." Compare line 3028.

P. 89, l. 974. Peer's reference in his mother's ability to ride through the rapidest river is of course to his carrying her across the river in the first act.

Pp. 212 f., l. 2452, *ab esse ad posse*. The comment upon Peer's faultless Latin is doubtless correct enough, so far as words and grammar are concerned, but the commentator has failed to note that Peer has twisted his quotation, as in other cases. Not only is *a posse ad esse* the familiar form, but it alone gives the sense required, if the other indeed gives any sense at all. The reviewer notes the use of this Latin expression in a philosophical article of Heiberg,<sup>3</sup> and is reminded that Logeman in his commentary has failed to indicate sufficiently Ibsen's reaction to the philosophy of his day. Even Begriffenfeldt he does not connect with Hegelianism specifically or German philosophy more generally, in which he may be right, but the German in general has already been personified in von Eberkopf.

P. 213, l. 2461. In alluding to the influence of Oehlenschläger's *Aladdin* the commentator omits reference to the literature upon the subject.<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Cf. F. Jónsson in revised edition of Egilsson's *Lexicon Poeticum*, 602, 1916.

<sup>2</sup> *Jour. Eng. and Germ. Phil.*, XVI, 67, 1917.

<sup>3</sup> *Prosaíske Skrifter*, II, 56: *a posse ad esse valet consequentia* (published 1857).

<sup>4</sup> Cf. *Jour. Eng. and Germ. Phil.*, XV, 51 ff., 1916 and the literature there cited.

P. 217, l. 2567, *Saa kanst du faa*. The translation "Then of course you must get one" should be corrected to "Then you can get one," i.e., "I am ready to furnish you one," as is clear from the following lines.

P. 218, l. 2579, *Profeten er god*. The statement that the nominative is here used as a vocative is perhaps not the best way of putting it. It is used entirely as a nominative, in that the expression is in the third person, not the second.

P. 250, l. 3034. "This play, otherwise too much imbued with stiff Dano-Norwegian" is a point upon which there may be two opinions. Probably the statement is stronger than the commentator intended. One is irresistibly reminded of von Eberkopf's comment on the French language: *Ej wass! Det Sprog er og saa stivt.*"

P. 345, l. 4496, *De flectes Seen ins Blaue slutter i Støbeskeen*. It is not fully clear why comment is denied this passage.

Finally, casual test of the Index (pp. 477-84) shows that it is not as complete as desirable and that references to lines here and in other parts of the book have not been checked up to absolute correspondence.

A. LEROY ANDREWS

CORNELL UNIVERSITY